REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present submission is responsive to the Office Action of October 19, 2007, in which claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are presently pending. A courtesy copy of the claims is provided above. Of those, each of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,155,425 to Nykanen, in view of U.S. Patent 6,985,939 to Fletcher, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

The Applicants have reviewed the grounds for rejection of each of the pending claims and respectfully traverse the same for the reason that the combination of Nykanen and Fletcher references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that (1) all elements of the claimed invention are disclosed in the prior art; (2) that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or to combine references; and (3) that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Thus, under the first element, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be

considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The present disclosure is directed toward improving the quality of the match results provided by a Web service registry, such as a UDDI registry, via providing a means to publish multiple external matching engines as Web Services themselves and providing mechanisms within the UDDI registry to find and use the services of these external matching engines to provide better match results to a given a request.

To this end, independent claim 1, for example, recites the following capability:

"...selecting from a plurality of external matching services an external matching service which is capable of comparing the service requirements and service capabilities..."

Neither Nykanen nor Fletcher, either alone or in combination, teaches this claimed capability. Nykanen is cited for the alleged teaching (column 7 line 45 and column 8 and line 42) of querying a UDDI registry to obtain information about a business and its exposed services. However, this is merely a query of a UDDI registry, not the ability to improve the results of the search via providing a means to publish and then use external matching engines from within UDDI registry while conducting the search for Web services.

More pertinently, Fletcher is cited by the Examiner as teaching the above highlighted claim language of "selecting from a plurality of external matching services an external matching service which is capable of comparing the service requirements and service capabilities," but no explanation is provided in the present Office Action as to how that conclusion can be derived from a review of the teachings of Fletcher. The Applicants have reviewed the cited portions of Fletcher and respectfully note that the

reference does not make any statements about how the quality of match results returned by UDDI registry can be improved by providing the claimed selecting mechanism to use the services of external matching engines published as Web services in the UDDI registry. According to the teachings of Fletcher, an approach is presented for dynamically assembling software resources including Web services from within a portal-based platform. Fletcher's work uses the search services of service registries such as UDDI but does not provide specific description about improving the quality of match results by "selecting from a plurality of external matching services an external matching service which is capable of comparing the service requirements and service capabilities."

In particular, column 7, lines 15-54 of Fletcher cited by the Examiner describes how Web services can be bound automatically via proxies. However, it does not say anything about selecting from a plurality of external matching services an external matching service which is capable of comparing the service requirements and service capabilities. Further, in column 10, lines 39-60 Fletcher discusses how newly composed Web services can be published back to the UDDI registry to be discovered via conventional means. This publishing back of newly created Web services is not the same as publishing external matching engines. In the present disclosure, while these external matching engines can also be discovered via conventional means in the UDDI registry, the search function of UDDI registry is modified to look for these external matching engines. In the case of Fletcher, the intent of publishing the newly composed services is not for the purpose of improving the quality of search results.

Finally, column 8, lines 15-22 of Fletcher simply restate that a newly aggregated Web service is available for further composition. Again, this fails to teach the claimed process of selecting from a plurality of external matching services an external matching service which is capable of comparing the service requirements and service capabilities.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, since at least this claim element is missing from the combined teachings of Nykanen and Fletcher, the pending claims are not obvious in view of the same.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered. If any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-0510 maintained by Applicants' assignee.

Respectfully submitted,
RAMA K.T. AKKIRAJU, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By 
Sean F. Sullivan
Registration No. 38,328
Customer No. 48915

Date: January 16, 2008
Address: 20 Church Street, Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929